

REMARKS:

The cancellation of Claim 11 and the renumbering of dependent Claims 27 and 28 to depend on Claim 1 will result in removing the metallic fibers of Ohya, et al from Applicants' claim coverage and will further distinguish the claims from Ohya, et al..

Ohya, et al requires the inclusion of metallic fibers into the yarn, and that requirement is consistent throughout their abstract, specification and claims. As indicated in Applicants' previous amendment, Ohya, et al employs both chopped fibers and spiral wound fibers (see Col. 6, first paragraph), but this construction will weaken the preform fabric. As discussed in Applicants' previous amendment, the reference to Nels (Col. 6, paragraph 1) states that spiral weaving causes the construction of the yarn to become weakened. Obviously, Ohya, et al consider the inclusion of metallic fibers necessary to add strength to their preformed yarn. By contrast, Applicants' claimed yarn is both continuous and untwisted, and hence does not require the type of metallic fiber reinforcement as the Ohya, et al product.

The patents to Hartness, et al and Dyksterhousse, et al, were also cited by the Patent Examiner, but were not applied. Both of these two patents disclose the use of cyanate ester resins in fabric forming, carbon or graphite material. However, these two patents disclose that their respective fabric forming materials are designed to be void-free products. By contrast, Applicants' material is specifically designed as a product inherently containing voids, as noted in Applicants' introductory claim description as a "wet friction coupling".

It will be apparent that both Ohya, et al and Nels approached a similar problem in two different ways. Both Ohya, et al and Nels employ spiral weaving, even though spiral weaving weakened their fabric materials.


Nels' approach was to utilize the transmission fluid as a cooling medium to avoid the problem of broken fibrils (FIG. 4 B) caused by his requirement for mandatory spiral weaving; Nels also uses phenolics as the preferred resin.

The approach of Ohya, et al avoids the problem of weakened fibrils due to spiral weaving by employing metallic fibers to strengthen the fabric; excessive heat generated during use is conducted both along the metallic fibers and by the transmission fluid itself. Of course, using metallic fibers is an expensive proposition.

Applicants' claim narrowing using the term, "consisting of", rather than, "comprising" will further restrict the claim coverage to a product: 1. containing voids, rather than being void free; 2. use of continuous fibers, rather than chopped fibers; 3. use of untwisted yarn, rather than twisted (i.e., spiral wound) yarn; and, 4. use of cyanate resins or oligomers thereof, rather than other types of resin systems.

Respectfully submitted,

April 30, 2004
DATED


W. KRAWITZ
(714) 974-1190

This will certify that this amendment, amendment claim status and clean

copy of the claims were placed in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 and deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail on April 30, 2004.

April 30, 2004


W. KRAWITZ